



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,562	03/08/2004	Christopher W. Blackburn	1842.027US1	1074
70648	7590	09/15/2009	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				LIPMAN, JACOB
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2434		
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
09/15/2009			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com
request@slwip.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/796,562
Filing Date: March 08, 2004
Appellant(s): BLACKBURN ET AL.

Rodney L. Lacy
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 13 July 2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 11 September 2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

The applications listed in the appeal brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The amendment after final rejection filed on 13 July 2009 has been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

A substantially correct copy of appealed claims appears on pages 16-19 of the Appendix to the appellant's brief. The minor errors are as follows: Claims 10 and 24 were canceled in the submitted amendment.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6916247 Gatto et al. 4-2002 (filed)

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9, 11-23, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gatto el al., USPN 6,916,247.

With regard to claims 1 and 15, Gatto discloses a method for providing an authorization service (CA) in a gaming network including gaming machines (column 2 lines 46-61), the method including publishing the availability of the authorization service on the gaming network, sending service information for a gaming service to a discovery agent (Authentication agent 834) on the gaming network (column 10 lines 9-13), receiving by the authorization service (CA) from the discovery agent a request to authorize the gaming agent (column 10 lines 55-58), providing an authorization response to the discovery agent (column 10 lines 58-82), in response to determining by the discovery agent using the authorization response that the gaming device is

authentic and authorized (column 10 lines 58-60), publishing by the discovery agent service information to a service repository to make the gaming service available on the gaming network (column 10 lines 58-62), discovering by the gaming service the availability of the authorization service, and processing one or more service requests between the gaming service and the authorization service (column 10 lines 55-62), said service requests conforming to an internetworking protocol (column 3 lines 20-28).

With regard to claims 2-6 and 16-20, Gatto discloses the authorization service is a web service where service requests are WSDL formatted and UDDI registries are utilized (column 15 lines 33-56).

With regard to claims 7-9, 11, 12, 21-23, 25, and 26, Gatto discloses the authorization service can be local (column 10 lines 55-58).

With regard to claims 13 and 27 Gatto discloses the authorization service returning results (column 10 lines 55-59).

With regard to claims 14 and 28, Gatto discloses returning an access list for a set of client credentials submitted (identification presented) to the authorization service (column 10 lines 55-62).

(10) Response to Argument

With regard to applicant's argument that the authentication engine of Gatto is not a discovery agent since it does not attempt to authorize a gaming service, the examiner disagrees. Gatto discloses the authentication engine contacts the CA in an effort to "authorize a given operation" (column 10 line 59). Further, to authorize a gaming service reads on by authorizing the connection of a gaming device to the network (column 12

Art Unit: 2434

lines 28-37), especially since the devices being proper is essential to the gaming itself (column 12 lines 1-42). The authentication engine is therefor a discovery agent that contacts the CA to authorize a gaming service and publishes the data (column 12 lines 34-36).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jacob Lipman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2434

Conferees:

Michael Simitoski

/Michael J Simitoski/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

Kambiz Zand

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434